

Pangasa Pleadings contain a number of procedural defects⁷ and that the Pangasa Pleadings were not served upon either AT&T or 700 in contravention of section 1.939(c) of the Commission's rules.⁸ Mr. Pangasa did not respond to the Joint Opposition.

II. DISCUSSION

4. The Communications Act of 1934, as amended, and the Commission's rules require that a petition to deny must contain specific allegations of fact sufficient to show that the petitioner is a party in interest.⁹ To establish party-in-interest standing, a petitioner must allege facts sufficient to demonstrate that grant of the subject application would cause it to suffer a direct injury.¹⁰ In addition, a petitioner must demonstrate a causal link between the claimed injury and the challenged action: it must demonstrate that the injury can be traced to the challenged action and that the injury would be prevented or redressed by the relief requested.¹¹ The Commission repeatedly has upheld these standards.¹²

5. We find that neither the Pangasa Petition nor any of his various subsequent filings asserts specific allegations of fact sufficient to show that Mr. Pangasa is a party in interest with respect to this transaction. Instead, Mr. Pangasa's submissions raise general concerns about spectrum aggregation and various wireless industry practices. The Pangasa Pleadings do not explain how Mr. Pangasa might be injured by an assignment of spectrum to AT&T, much less how any such injury might be redressed by denying or conditioning the Application. We accordingly dismiss the Pangasa Pleadings, including the Petition, for lack of party-in-interest standing.¹³

III. ORDERING CLAUSES

6. Accordingly, having reviewed the Application and the record in this matter, IT IS ORDERED that, pursuant to sections 4(i) and (j), 309, and 310(d) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, 47 U.S.C. §§ 154(i), (j), 309, 310(d), the Petition and Pleadings filed by Maneesh Pangasa are hereby DISMISSED for the reasons stated herein.

7. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED, pursuant to sections 4(i) and 309 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, 47 U.S.C. §§ 154(i), 309, that the staff of the Mobility Division of the Wireless Telecommunications Bureau SHALL PROCESS the following application consistent with this *Order* and the Commission's rules: ULS File No. 0005262760.

⁷ The alleged defects include failure to provide the filer's name, street address, telephone number, or signature. Joint Opposition at 3-4.

⁸ *Id.* at 4; *see* 47 C.F.R. § 1.939(c).

⁹ 47 U.S.C. § 309(d)(1); 47 C.F.R. § 1.939(d).

¹⁰ Applications of T-Mobile License, LLC, AT&T Mobility Spectrum LLC and New Cingular Wireless PCS, LLC For Consent to Assign AWS-1 Licenses, *Order*, 27 FCC Rcd 4124, 4126 ¶ 6 (WTB 2012) ("*T-Mobile-AT&T Order*"); Wireless Co., L.P., *Order*, 10 FCC Rcd 13233, 13235 ¶ 7 (WTB 1995) ("*Wireless Co.*"), citing *Sierra Club v. Morton*, 405 U.S. 727, 733 (1972).

¹¹ *T-Mobile-AT&T Order*, 27 FCC Rcd at 4126 ¶ 6; *Wireless Co.*, 10 FCC Rcd at 13235 ¶ 7.

¹² *See, e.g.*, Application of New Cingular Wireless PCS, LLC and D&E Investments, Inc. For Consent to Assign Lower 700 MHz C Block Licenses, *Order*, 27 FCC Rcd 1669, 1670-71 ¶ 6 (WTB 2012).

¹³ In this instance, because we find that the Petition does not demonstrate the requisite party-in-interest standing, we need not decide whether it should be dismissed based on the procedural deficiencies alleged by the Applicants.

8. This action is taken under delegated authority pursuant to sections 0.131 and 0.331 of the Commission's rules, 47 C.F.R. §§ 0.131, 0.331.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Katherine M. Harris
Deputy Chief, Mobility Division
Wireless Telecommunications Bureau